DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 732 UD 018 176

AUTHOR Kovner, Albert; And Others
TITLE An Evaluation of Project LEAP, E.S.E.A. Title I Program of Medford, Massachusetts, 1975-1976.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 85p.; For related documents, see UD 018 177 and UD 018 452

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; Comparative Statistics; *Compensatory Education Programs; *Elementary Education; Language Arts; Parent Participation; Physical Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Reading Improvement; Speech Therapy; Staff Improvement; Student Behavior; *Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Massachusetts (Medford)

ABSTRACT

This report consists of a description, evaluation, and supporting data of an elementary school level Title I program. The Medford, Massachusetts Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I program for the 1975-76 school year was conducted in thirteen public and parochial schools. The program provided reading and language arts instruction, physical education, speech therapy and counseling. It was supported by extensive inservice staff development efforts and a highly involved parent advisory council. Substantial gains were made in tests of reading vocabulary and comprehension, language, spelling, phonics and word analysis in grades two through six. Kindergarten children made significant gains in knowledge of letters and sounds and in aural comprehension. Children selected for physical education made gains in most areas of a test of psychomotor development. Positive changes in behavior and attitudes were also in evidence in the children as a whole at the end of the program year. (Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156732

AN EVALUATION OF PROJECT LEAP, E.S.E.A. TITLE I PROGRAM OF MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS 1975-1976

ALBERT KOVNER

LESLIE BURG

MAURICE KAUFMAN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maurice Kaufman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

BOSTON

1976

UD018176

EVALUATION OF PROJECT LEAP, 1975-1976

ABSTRACT

The Medford, Massachusetts ESEA Title I program for the 1975-1976 school year was conducted in thirteen public and parochial schools for children in grades K-6. The program provided reading and language arts instruction, physical education, speech therapy, and counseling. The program was supported by extensive inservice staff development efforts and a highly involved Parent Advisory Council. Substantial gains were made in tests of reading vocabulary and comprehension, language, spelling, phonics and word analysis in grades two through six. Kindergarten children made significant gains in knowledge of letters and sounds and in aural comprehension. Children selected for physical education made significant gains in most areas of a test of psychomotor development. On the whole, children showed more positive behavior on a post-administration of a behavior-attitude checklist than on the initial administration. Parents expressed their approval of the program.

CONTENTS

Page

Description of the Program 1

Evaluation of the Program in Progress. 5

Test Results and Analysis

California Achievement Tests. 13

Stanford Early School Achievement Test. 25

Phonics 27

Structural Analysis 30

Physical Education 30

Referrals Under Chapter 766 33

Behavior/Attitude Checklist--Affective Domain . . . 37

Results of Parent Questionnaire 44

Parent Advisory Council Comments 52

Conclusions 57

Recommendations. 58

Appendix

Psychomotor Development Check Lists 62

Report of Specialists

Remedial Reading 69

Speech and Language. 73

Physical Education 76

School Adjustment Counselor 79

Consulting Psychologist 81

Description of the Program

General

The Language Education Acceleration Program, LEAP, which Medford offers students under the aegis of Title I, E.S.E.A., is clearly described by the Director:

The basic goal of this program is to strengthen the Communication Skills, and the emotional and academic foundations on which such skills are based, of a specified number of children falling consideraly below established norms in such skills, who currently reside in the identified target school attendance areas.

The vehicle to realize this goal will be a coordinated and concentrated multi-disciplinary team of Communication Specialists and teachers, federally funded, working in conjunction with and supplementing specialists now at work in the school department.

Our premise is that every child has a right to the full development and natural evolvement of his latent communication abilities regardless of socio-economic, emotional, receptive or expressive, graphic or verbal disabilities.

The Director, together with the Evaluators, Title I specialists and teachers, will identify the priority communications needs of children in the groups.

Specific needs in speech and reading will be met by

specialists in those fields. In addition, Title I teachers will supplement instruction and be supportive of identified children both in the classroom and in small groups and tutorial relationships.

The foregoing Instructional Staff will have as its main responsibility the development of skills in the Cognitive and Affective Domains.

Since communication deficiencies sometimes have roots in social or emotional problems, the program will include a school adjustment counselor who will be available to supplement the work of the regularly assigned school adjustment counselor and the school psychologist. The attention of these existing and Title I services will be focused on Psychological, Social, and Interpersonal Relationship Skills Development.

The Physical Development of the children will be monitored by existing health services of the school department.

Motor Development will be among the responsibilities of the appropriate physical education specialists as prescribed by the school department. The Title I staff will include a Developmental Physical Education Specialist to supplement the work of the school department physical education program.

The list of concerns is long. They form the basis and foundation of the program. The keystone, however, is their

effective coordination with existing instructional and related services and their focused concentration on priority needs. This will be accomplished through frequent consultation and cooperation with the Administrators' Advisory Council and the Parent Advisory Council.

TITLE I - LEAP OBJECTIVES

COGNITIVE

1. To reduce significantly the numbers of children scoring below grade in language skills on regularly administered standardized tests.

2. To increase substantially the numbers of children meeting grade level norms in paragraph meaning sections of regularly administered standardized tests.

3. To provide supplementary coordinated and concentrated remedial services to qualified and identified children.

4. To focus the attention of all school department services, existing and Title I, on the priority needs of educationally deprived children to strengthen all aspects of their language acquisition skill in order to realize their highest potential for effective communication.

AFFECTIVE DOMAIN

Within the affective domain, activities of the program are directed so that:

1. The child will choose to share with the class, through bulletin boards, show and tell, etc., a project he has completed.

2. The child will use effective communication in peer relationships.

3. The child will listen carefully to directions.

4. The child will carry out instructions to the best of his ability, including oral and graphic instructions commensurate with his maturity.

5. The child will treat other children as he wishes to be treated, acknowledging communication is multi-directional.

6. The child will accept constructive criticism by trying to correct his mistake, rather than by denying the mistake.

7. The child will, through oral communication skills, share his ideas with the class voluntarily.

8. The child will consider his actions and the results of those actions as an aid in making decisions.

9. The child will act in accordance with rules made by the class.

10. The child will give others a chance to speak without interrupting, respecting their right to communicate.

Evaluation of the Program in Progress

This section is based on the periodic visits made by the evaluators and on information collected by the program Director. The evaluators visited the program several times each month, held meetings with the LEAP staff and with the Parent Advisory Council, and one evaluator (Burg) presented a workshop on the language-experience approach to teaching reading.

The facilities in which the LEAP program was conducted at the several schools can be described as good to excellent. A comfortable room was provided at the Hervey school, in which the program was introduced this year, and within a short time the building principal provided needed storage space for materials and records. As was the case last year, most of the target schools provided a separate room for instructional purposes. Physical facilities at the Tufts school were improved by removing from the room a large cabinet. This provided a much larger space for instruction. The room now appears to be adequate for small groups of children. At the Osgood school instruction is conducted in a large basement room. Shifting to another room during certain times, which was the practice last year, was not necessary this year. However, acoustically the room is poor. Evidently there are plans to renovate that include partitioning and improving

the acoustic quality. These plans have not been implemented to date.

The LEAP program continues to provide its staff with a wide array of teaching materials including many types of hardware and software. A central resource center is used to permit pooling of certain materials and to increase their availability to the entire staff. This center has been used by the staff to good advantage. This year, materials were acquired which permit teachers to develop individualized programs for children on cassettes, tapes, language-master cards, and "lectralearn" programs. Teachers are developing many of their own instructional programs and materials. Assistance is provided by a Title I instructor with background in audio-visual work. Also new this year is the introduction of materials with which children can prepare their own filmstrips and photographic materials. Certain materials are made available to parents for use at home. Some PAC members borrowed books from the resource center to read with their children during the summer.

Title I Instructors continue to conduct a program of very high quality. The evaluators observed an increasingly individualized program of instruction. Considerable attention is paid to diagnosis. In addition to standardized tests and evaluator-constructed instruments, instructors use

the checklists of behavioral objectives developed in past years and prepared in final form in 1974-1975. These checklists are used periodically to provide timely information on a pupil's abilities and needs. Test information is recorded on individual profile charts so that pertinent information is available to the Instructor and can be shared with classroom teachers and specialists. Diagnosis is also on-going, that is--teaching is done diagnostically. The diagnostic efforts are characteristically followed by selection of precise instructional objectives which focus on the identified needs. Further diagnostic procedures are used by program specialists. These are outlined in specialists' reports (see Appendix).

There was this year greater use of experimentally-based teaching. This has the advantage of maintaining a high level of motivation for learning and encourages the application of newly acquired skills in a meaningful and realistic context.

At each school, children were encouraged to become expert in some are of interest. This technique was reflected in the selection of materials and procedures, and results in increased motivation for learning.

Instructors at the Osgood school worked with about six non-English speaking children. They were able to work effectively with these children integrated in regular groups.

With continuing or increasing responsibility for non-English speaking children at the Osgood school or other schools, it will probably be necessary to provide Instructors with specially designed materials and with in-service instruction on teaching English as a second language.

In addition to Instructors, certain specialists were included in the LEAP staff. These roles were essentially the same as the positions in the previous year's program. Among these specialists, positions were the Remedial Reading Specialist, Speech and Language Pathologist, Physical Education Specialist, School Adjustment Counselor, and Consulting Psychologist. All specialists appear to be working very well with children, LEAP staff, classroom teachers, and, when necessary, with parents. In keeping with the ninth recommendation of the 1974-1975 evaluation report, specialists have expanded their role as providers of in-service training for the staff. For example, in-service workshops were provided by the LEAP Reading Specialists, by the Speech and Language Specialists (dealing with early language development) and by the Adjustment Counselor (concerning the affective domain). The specialists have also met with the PAC. For example, the Physical Education Specialist discussed his role at one PAC meeting. The role of the Adjustment Counselor was presented at another meeting. There has been frequent communication between specialists on the Title I staff and their

counterparts on school facilities and with classroom teachers. The specific functions of specialists with the children in the LEAP program are outlined in the specialists reports included in the Appendix to this report. These responsibilities include the use of a variety of diagnostic instruments and procedures unavailable to Instructors working alone, and instructional responsibilities.

Through the efforts of the new program Director Mrs. Elizabeth Miles, considerable attention was paid to staff development. In-service instruction was accomplished through a combination of weekly staff meetings; in-service workshops conducted by staff specialists; workshops conducted by specialists external to the LEAP program, including Mr. Tim Wilson, Director of Arlington's Title I program, and Mrs. Gwen Blackburn, head of the Medford Multi-Cultural Program; visits to other exemplary Title I programs in Massachusetts; and attendance at state and regional conferences, including meetings of associations for speech and hearing reading, and learning disabilities, a lecture by Carol Chornsky sponsored by Massachusetts General Hospital Language Clinic, state workshops for state and federally assisted educational programs, and an elementary school physical education workshop. Relevant information was shared with the LEAP staff by members who made visits or attended conferences or workshops.

The efforts of the program Director-Supervisor, Mrs. Miles, and of the PAC resulted in greater parent involvement this year. Parents have used the materials in the resource center. Parents sponsored kindergarten teas at each Title I school to inform other parents about the program. In addition, parents visited other outstanding Title I programs along with LEAP staff members, such as the Arlington program. Also, they attended state and regional conferences, including the Tri-City Parent Workshop, and workshops presented by LEAP specialists.

Through the PAC, parents attended meetings with the evaluators to discuss the findings of last year's program. They also collated the information from the survey of parent attitudes in the present evaluation.

Parents were involved in the special exhibit: Traveling Sound and Sight Exhibit of Our Title I Program. Parents traveled with the exhibit, distributed the LEAP Title I Parents' Handbook, and answered questions about the program. Preparation of the Handbook was also a project of the parents.

The PAC presented each child in Title I with a bookmark and discussed books to read during the summer. Some parents compiled lists of books with the help of the Title I Instructors and prepared forms for recording books read during the

summer. This practice could lead to a strong and positive value being placed on reading in the home with an accompanying transfer to school attitudes. A practice similar to this should be tried during the school year as well.

The foregoing paragraphs that describe parent involvement show that parents made a significant contribution to the program. In addition, parents provided their children with much support. This promises to increase the effectiveness of LEAP.

The community was kept well informed about project LEAP. The parents who participated in various ways were obviously informed about the program. In addition, the Traveling Sound and Sight Exhibit brought the program in a very tangible way to a wide audience. The exhibit consists of a continuous slide program, film strips, and cassettes prepared by children in the program and shown on the Dukane sound and sight projector, as well as a display of children's original creative works (stories, poems, books and games). The exhibit is demonstrated by children who are accompanied by a parent. The parent is able to answer questions about the program. The exhibit was presented at the City-Wide Multi-Cultural Fair on May 9 and 10, 1976, where it won first prize. It was also presented at other locations.

Program information was also disseminated to the community through teas, open-house activities, and through

newspaper articles. One article announced a parent workshop, another article reported a circus presented by the children of the LEAP program at the Osgood school, and a third article reported a visit by federal and state evaluators.

LEAP is well supported by the administrative staff of the LEAP office. Pupil records are very well maintained and tests and instructional materials are obtained and distributed in a timely way. The central school department administration and building principals have been very supportive and cooperative. The many aspects of the program have been commended by Shirley Roberts, Title I supervisor from the Massachusetts Department of Education (letter dated December 4, 1975). The evaluators agree with Ms. Roberts that the appointment of Mrs. Miles as both Director and Supervisor "will provide the continuity needed to ensure the continued success of Project LEAP."

Test Results and Analysis

California Achievement Tests

The principle test for measuring pupil achievement was the California Achievement Test. Children who entered the program at the start of the school year were pretested in October 1975 on form A and post-tested in May 1976 on form B, except first-graders who were post-tested only. Test results for these children are reported in Tables 1, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 9.

The Title I program was introduced later in the year at the Hervey and St. Raphael schools. Pretests were administered in December and post-tests in May. These results are reported in Table 2, 4, and 6. Only five second-graders and three third-graders from Hervey and St. Raphael were pre- and post-tested. Their results are not included in the general analysis of data. The results of the ten first-graders from these two schools are similar to those of the first-graders of the other schools.

As shown in Tables 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9, all grade levels of children made statistically significant gains on all subtests in the eight months from October to May. Mean gains ranged from 5.6 months to 7.5 months on reading vocabulary; 4.8 months to 11.4 months on reading comprehension; 5.6 months to 9.5 months on total reading; 3.8 months gain on auding; 8.4 months to 13.5 months on language mechanics;

TABLE 1

Final California Achievement Test Results of First Graders (Excluding Hervey and St. Raphael Schools), N = 89

	Test	Grade Score	
		Mean	S.D.
1.	Reading vocab.	2.05*	.60
2.	Reading compr.	1.57**	.72
3.	Total reading	1.96	.60
4.	Auding	1.51**	1.01
5.	Language mechanics	1.39**	.63
6.	Usage/structure	1.51**	.74
7.	Total language	1.39**	.59
8.	Spelling	1.64**	.73

*Significantly greater than grade placement of 1.9.

**Significantly less than grade placement of 1.9.

TABLE 2

Final California Achievement Test Results of First Graders of Hervey and St. Raphael Schools, N = 10

Test	Grade Score	
	Mean	S.D.
1. Reading vocab.	1.80	.57
2. Reading compr.	0.54*	.87
3. Total reading	1.74	.54
4. Auding	1.00*	.55
5. Language mechanics	1.05*	.94
6. Usage/structure	1.11*	.51
7. Total language	0.79*	.34
8. Spelling	0.77*	.97

*Significantly less than grade placement of 1.9.

TABLE 3

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results
on the California Achievement Test
(Excluding Hervey and St. Raphael Schools)
Level 1 for Grade 2, N = 61

Test	Pretest Mean and S.D.	Post-Test Mean and S.D.	t	P
Reading vocab.	2.37 .57	3.12 .64	12.367	<.001
Reading compr.	1.97 .73	2.84 .88	7.524	<.001
Total reading	2.26 .44	2.97 .62	11.720	<.001
Auding	2.18 1.34	2.56 1.26	2.154	<.05
Language mechanics	1.83 .58	2.67 .82	8.839	<.001
Usage and structure	2.03 1.00	2.83 1.07	4.710	<.001
Total language	1.87 .57	2.66 .74	11.516	<.001
Spelling	2.00 .71	2.91 .70	9.581	<.001

TABLE 4

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results from 12/75 to 6/76
on the California Achievement Test for Pupils
of Hervey and St. Raphael Schools
Level 1 for Grade 2, N = 5

Test	Pretest Mean	Post-Test Mean
Reading vocab.	1.98	3.02
Reading compr.	1.68	2.44
Total reading	1.96	2.72
Auding	.94	1.16
Language mechanics	2.16	2.02
Usage and structure	1.14	1.46
Total language	1.24	1.76
Spelling	1.54	2.98

TABLE 5

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results
on the California Achievement Test
Level 2 for Grade 3, N = 69

Test	Pretest Mean and S.D.	Post-Test Mean and S.D.	t	P
Reading vocab.	2.59 .88	3.21 .86	5.774	<.001
Reading compr.	2.51 .62	3.36 .91	8.597	<.001
Total reading	2.54 .63	3.28 .76	9.607	<.001
Language mechanics	2.54 .67	3.52 1.01	9.418	<.001
Usage and structure	2.41 .88	3.17 1.10	6.393	<.001
Total language	2.51 .56	3.42 .89	11.231	<.001
Spelling	2.75 .96	3.41 .96	5.879	<.001

TABLE 6

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results from 12/75 to 6/76
on the California Achievement Test for Pupils
of Hervey and St. Raphael Schools
Level 2 for Grade 3, N = 3

Test	Pretest Mean	Post-Test Mean
Reading vocab.	2.40	3.07
Reading compr.	2.57	3.10
Total reading	2.60	2.97
Language mechanics	1.13	2.97
Usage and structure	1.77	2.83
Total language	1.40	2.93
Spelling	2.93	2.83

TABLE 7

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results
on the California Achievement Test
Level 2 for Grade 4, N = 75

Test	Pretest Mean and S.D.	Post-Test Mean and S.D.	t	P
Reading vocab.	3.74 1.01	4.36 .91	5.791	<.001
Reading compr.	3.51 .91	4.65 1.24	8.984	<.001
Total reading	3.49 .72	4.44 .95	10.754	<.001
Language mechanics	3.70 .92	4.94 1.22	9.647	<.001
Usage and structure	3.59 1.08	4.38 1.50	4.717	<.001
Total	3.65 .80	4.75 1.09	10.209	<.001
Spelling	3.67 1.27	4.49 1.49	5.537	<.001

TABLE 8

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results
on the California Achievement Test
Level 3 for Grade 5, N = 88

Test	Pretest Mean and S.D.	Post-Test Mean and S.D.	t	P
Reading vocab.	4.21 .91	4.79 1.10	6.330	<.001
Reading compr.	4.13 .91	4.61 1.05	4.451	<.001
Total reading	4.19 .74	4.75 .90	7.682	<.001
Language mechanics	5.32 1.13	6.55 1.62	9.022	<.001
Usage and structure	4.54 1.33	5.02 1.62	2.425	<.05
Total language	5.16 .98	6.16 1.31	8.448	<.001
Spelling	4.35 1.22	5.16 1.47	6.096	<.001

TABLE 9

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results
on the California Achievement Test
Level 3 for Grade 6, N = 86

Test	Pretest Mean and S.D.	Post-Test Mean and S.D.	t	P
Reading vocab.	4.80 1.10	5.36 1.07	6.372	<.001
Reading compr.	4.94 1.17	5.51 1.35	4.137	<.001
Total reading	4.87 .90	5.44 1.00	7.231	<.001
Language mechanics	5.99 1.48	7.34 1.42	11.738	<.001
Usage and structure	5.43 1.66	6.23 2.08	3.359	<.01
Total language	5.77 1.26	6.97 1.24	11.927	<.001
Spelling	5.31 1.60	6.33 1.50	6.979	<.001

4.8 months to 8.0 months on usage and structure; 7.9 months to 12.0 months on total language; 8.1 months to 10.2 months on spelling. These results are based on differences in mean grade equivalent scores which use a ten month school year (hence, a 12 month gain is interpreted as a gain of 1 year and 2 months).

A total of 89 first-graders were tested after eight months in the program, and ten others at Hervey and St. Raphael schools after six months. The eighty-nine were on the average significantly above grade placement in reading vocabulary, but significantly below in most other areas tested. Clearly, many of these children require further supplementary service in the future. The children at Hervey and St. Raphael, and the children at Kennedy (N = 10) were not above grade placement in reading vocabulary. First graders at Franklin school (N = 11) were at the expected grade placement of 1.9 in spelling.

The results of sixty-one second graders are reported in Table 3, and those of five children from Hervey and St. Raphael in Table 4. On the May post-test, the sixty-one children were significantly above grade placement in reading vocabulary, but significantly below in auding, language mechanics, and total language. The results on the five second-graders from Hervey and St. Raphael are essentially similar. Second graders

at Franklin (N = 7) were not below grade placement on the auding post-test.

Sixty-nine third-graders and three from Hervey and St. Raphael were tested. Although significant gain was made on all post-tests ranging from 6.2 months to 9.8 months, third graders were significantly below grade placement (3.9) on all post-tests. The discrepancy was from 3.8 months to 7.3 months below. In no case can this be considered a very large difference. These results were similar to those found in the 1974-1975 evaluation. These results occurred generally in each school except Franklin (N = 8) where the children were not below grade placement on the language mechanics post-test.

Seventy-five fourth-graders were tested. Post-test results in reading, vocabulary, total reading, usage/structure, and spelling were significantly below grade placement of 4.9. Performance at each school was generally consistent with the overall picture with the following exceptions. Fourth graders at Franklin (N = 12) and Osgood (N = 7) were not below grade placement on the spelling post-test; fourth graders at Osgood and Columbus (N = 10) were not below grade placement on the usage/structure post-test.

Fifth-graders (N = 88) were significantly above grade placement on the language mechanics post-test, but below grade placement in reading (vocabulary, comprehension, and

total), usage/structure, and spelling. These results were reflected in essentials at each school except that Osgood (N = 7) was not above grade placement in the language mechanics post-test.

Results very similar to those found for the fifth grade were found for the sixth grade (N = 86). It should be noted that both fifth and sixth graders received the same tests (level 3 forms A and B). Sixth graders were significantly above grade placement in language mechanics and below grade placement in post-tests of reading, usage/structure and spelling. Deviations from these findings at individual schools were the following. Osgood (N = 6) was not above grade placement on the language mechanics post-test; Tufts (N = 11) and Kennedy (N = 11) were not below grade placement on the usage/structure post-test; Kennedy (N = 11) was not below grade placement on the post-test of spelling.

Stanford Early School Achievement Test

Kindergarten children who participated in the Title I program were tested in January 1976 and May 1976 with the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, Level I, subtests of Letters and sounds, and Aural Comprehension. Pre- and post-tests were administered to forty-six children. Results are presented in Table 10. Highly significant improvement was made in both subtests.

TABLE 10

Progress of 46 Kindergarten Children on
Stanford Early School Achievement Subtests

Subtest	Pretest Mean Raw Score	Post-Test Mean Raw Score	t	P
Letters and sounds	13.80	20.22	8.266	<.001
Aural comprehension	13.37	17.85	5.930	<.001

A total of fifty-seven kindergarten children were in the Title I program. In addition, the May 1976 testing on the Stanford Early School led to the identification of sixty-two children for participation in 1976-1977.

Phonics

Ninety-nine first-graders were post-tested on phonics knowledge on or about April 30. These children showed substantial mastery of single consonants and short and long vowels. Moderate knowledge of consonant blends and digraphs is noted. Results are shown in Table 11.

Children in grades 2, 3 and 4 (excluding Hervey and St. Raphael) were tested in October and April. At each grade level children showed signficant improvement in phonics knowledge. Furthermore, mean post-test scores at each grade level showed near mastery of the four areas tested. The areas are single consonants (18 items), consonant blends (19 items), consonant digraphs (5 items), and vowels (10 items). These results are presented in Table 12.

Because of the small number of children in grades 2 and 3 at Hervey and grades 1, 2 and 3 at St. Raphael schools, results attained by first, second, and third graders (thirteen children in all) were combined for analysis. These children were pretested in December and post-tested in April. Significant improvement was made in knowledge of consonant

TABLE 11

April 1976 Phonics Achievement
of First-Graders (N = 99)

Test	Raw Score Mean	S.D.
1. Single consonants	15.8	3.55
2. Consonant blends	13.0	6.21
3. Consonant digraphs	2.3	1.84
4. Vowels	7.8	2.61
5. Total	38.9	12.01

TABLE 12

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Phonics Results

Scores	October 1975 Mean and S.D.	April 1976 Mean and S.D.	t	P
	Grade 2, N = 60			
S. cons.	16.7 1.8	17.4 .8	2.898	<.01
C. blends	14.2 4.5	18.0 1.9	6.326	<.001
C. digraphs	2.4 1.8	4.4 .8	9.383	<.001
Vowels	8.9 1.5	9.7 .7	3.965	<.001
Total	42.2 7.0	49.5 2.9	8.297	<.001
	Grade 3, N = 62			
S. cons.	16.7 2.3	17.3 1.7	3.208	<.01
C. blends	16.7 3.4	17.8 2.6	3.263	<.01
C. digraphs	3.3 1.5	4.5 1.0	6.046	<.001
Vowels	9.0 1.6	9.5 1.2	2.815	<.01
Total	45.7 7.3	49.0 5.5	5.461	<.001
	Grade 4, N = 81			
S. cons.	16.9 2.8	17.6 1.1	2.764	<.01
C. blends	17.3 2.7	18.2 2.3	3.704	<.001
C. digraphs	3.9 1.3	4.6 .9	6.165	<.001
Vowels	9.2 1.7	9.7 1.2	3.124	<.01
Total	47.3 6.6	50.1 4.9	6.226	<.001

digraphs and vowels. The apparent gain in consonants and consonent blends was not significant. Results are shown in Table 13.

Structural Analysis

Children in grades 5 and 6 were given tests of structural analysis in September 1975 and April 1976. They were tested on recognition of base words (8 items), prefixes (11 items), suffixes (8 items), and on syllable division (22 items). Pre- and post-test results are compared in Table 14. As shown in Table 14, fifth graders made significant gains in each area tested. Sixth graders made significant gains in recognition of base words and in syllable division. Sixth graders, as did fifth graders, attained substantial mastery of recognition of prefixes and suffixes on the post-test. Results suggest that additional training be given in syllable division. Recognition of base words may be of less importance in that the children can identify prefixes and suffixes.

Physical Education

The physical education specialist received referrals from classroom teachers, LEAP staff, and school department specialists. The children who were referred received instruction directed to particular weaknesses. The selected children were pre- and post-tested on a psychomotor development checklist devised from items on the Purdue Perceptual Motor

TABLE 13

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Phonics Results of Children in Grades One, Two and Three (N = 13) at Hervey and St. Raphael Schools

Scores	December 1975 Mean and S.D.	April 1976 Mean and S.D.	t	P
S. cons.	15.5	17.0	2.081	NS
	4.4	1.9		
C. blends	13.2	16.7	1.966	NS
	7.5	4.9		
C. digraphs	2.0	2.9	2.309	<.05
	2.0	1.7		
Vowels	7.0	8.5	2.915	<.05
	3.7	2.6		
Total	37.6	45.1	3.087	<.01
	15.4	10.0		

NS = Not significant.

TABLE 14

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results in Structural Analysis

Scores	Pretest Mean and S.D.	Post-Test Mean and S.D.	t	P
	Grade 5, N = 86			
Base words	4.5 1.9	5.1 1.8	2.526	<.05
Prefixes	9.5 2.7	10.5 1.3	3.333	<.01
Suffixes	6.4 2.2	6.9 1.2	2.031	<.05
Syllabication	11.8 3.8	14.4 3.3	5.969	<.001
Total	32.2 7.4	36.9 5.1	5.955	<.001
	Grade 6, N = 83			
Base words	4.8 1.8	5.6 1.8	3.634	<.001
Prefixes	9.7 2.4	10.3 2.1	1.724	NS
Suffixes	6.7 1.8	6.9 1.7	0.773	NS
Syllabication	14.1 3.2	15.7 2.8	5.195	<.001
Total	35.4 6.1	38.5 5.9	4.724	<.001

NS = Not significant.

Survey and the Medford Public Schools Physical Education Objectives list. The checklist was used to test children in six areas: (1) ball skills, (2) coordination, (3) balance, (4) body image and directionality, (5) strength, and (6) visual achievement. Results on this instrument are shown in Table 15. Assessment in body image and directionality was done only for first graders. Results showed significant gains in most areas. Gains failed to attain significance only where level of proficiency was initially high or where the number of children in a grade was quite small.

The Appendix of this report contains the items of the checklist. Each item was rated 0 or 1 on the basis of failure or success. Items can therefore be scored with considerable objectivity.

Referrals Under Chapter 766

Under Massachusetts law, children who appear to have special educational needs are referred for a CORE evaluation after which placement may be made in any of several special education programs. Under this law (Chapter 766), forty-seven children who participated in LEAP were referred. Of these, eleven are awaiting CORE evaluation or such evaluation is in progress. As a result of the CORE evaluation, certain children no longer continued in LEAP. Other children did continue in the Title I program and may receive other types of service under Chapter 766.

TABLE 15

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results on a Psychomotor Development Checklist

Subskill	Initial Mean and S.D.	Final Mean and S.D.	t	P
	Grade 1, N - 30			
Ball skills	2.6 1.1	3.9 0.4	6.713	<.001
Coordination	3.3 1.4	6.0 1.1	12.245	<.001
Balance	1.1 0.9	2.5 0.8	8.804	<.001
Body image and dir.	1.7 .8	2.7 .4	7.400	<.001
Strength	0.4 0.5	0.9 0.3	4.709	<.001
Visual Achiev.	0.6 0.8	1.3 0.7	4.535	<.001
	Grade 2, N = 21			
Ball skills	1.4 0.9	2.6 0.7	8.101	<.001
Coordination	1.7 1.0	3.5 0.7	8.455	<.001
Balance	1.7 1.0	2.8 0.5	5.645	<.001
Strength	0.9 0.8	1.8 0.4	5.403	<.001
Visual Achiev.	0.5 0.6	1.4 0.6	6.523	<.001
	Grade 3, N = 9			
Ball skills	2.8 1.9	4.7 0.7	3.900	<.01
Coordination	1.6 0.9	2.9 0.3	4.619	<.01
Balance	1.1 0.9	1.8 0.4	2.828	<.05
Strength	1.9 0.9	2.9 0.3	3.000	<.05
Visual Achiev.	0.7 0.7	1.2 0.8	1.890	NS

TABLE 15 (CONTINUED)

Subskill	Initial Mean and S.D.	Final Mean and S.D.	t	P
	Grade 4, N = 12			
Ball skills	3.2 1.2	4.9 0.3	4.988	<.001
Coordination	0.8 0.6	2.0 0.0	6.966	<.001
Balance	1.5 0.5	1.8 0.5	1.915	NS
Strength	1.4 1.0	2.8 0.5	5.204	<.001
Visual Achiev.	0.9 0.9	1.8 0.4	4.005	<.01
	Grade 5, N = 15			
Ball skills	1.7 1.2	3.4 1.1	5.493	<.001
Coordination	0.5 0.5	2.7 0.6	9.934	<.001
Balance	0.2 0.4	0.9 0.3	6.205	<.001
Strength	1.4 0.5	1.9 0.4	3.500	<.01
Visual Achiev.	0.9 0.5	1.6 0.5	4.785	<.001
	Grade 6, N = 4			
Ball skills	1.3 1.3	3.5 1.0	4.700	<.05
Coordination	0.3 0.5	3.0 0.0	11.000	<.01
Balance	0.5 0.6	1.0 0.0	1.732	NS
Strength	1.5 0.6	1.8 0.5	1.000	NS
Visual Achiev.	1.3 0.5	1.8 0.5	1.732	NS

NS = Not significant.

Referrals for CORE evaluation among participants in the Title I program were made for children in the following grades:

Grade	No. Referrals
K	2
1	12
2	6
3	12
4	5
5	5
6	5

Behavior/Attitude Checklist

The Behavior/Attitude checklist is an effort by the LEAP staff to deal with the affective domain: experiences and learnings which deal with changes in interest, attitude, values and "the development of appreciations and adequate adjustments."*

The checklist is completed twice: once in the fall of the year and again in the spring. It encourages teachers to be aware of those aspects of learning and experience which are frequently ignored in any statistical measure. The LEAP staff is to be commended for their continuing efforts to assess each child's growth and development in this important area. In another sense, the existence of the checklist helps teachers to focus on these aspects of learning and, where appropriate, to take the time to help children in self-assessment and self-reliance.

LEAP teachers have concentrated on the following four areas: Self-Confidence; Responsibility; Cooperation; and Interest. Specific statements support each of these general topics. A specimen copy of the checklist is found on the following pages.

---

*Bloom, B. S., Editor: Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, David McKay Company, New York, 1956.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

School_____ Title I - LEAP Child's Name_____

Affective Domain
Behavior Attitude Check List

LEAP Instructor
Recording Observation

_____
_____

Elizabeth N. Miles
Supervisor of Instruction

If the child usually shows the behavior indicated in the statement when the opportunity arises, mark the statement with a plus +.

If the child usually does not show the behavior at these time, indicate with a minus -.

If you cannot make the judgment, leave the item blank.

We plan to conduct these observations over a period of two years; therefore, please use the two columns between the first two double lines for the pre- and post-observations the first year, and the two columns between the second double lines for the second year.

Items	Date Recorded			
A. Self Confidence				
1. A child will attempt a new task voluntarily.				
2. The child will interact with adults and peers.				
3. The child will volunteer information.				
4. The child will complete a task independently.				
5. The child will express his ideas and opinions.				
6. The child will continue to maintain his own opinions or interest even after finding it unpopular.				
7. The child will interact with peers.				
B. Responsibility				
1. The child will attend school regularly.				
2. The child will arrive for classes on time.				
3. The child will bring the necessary materials to work in class.				
4. The child will take proper care of the materials and books assigned.				
5. The child will question material that is not understood.				

Medford Public Schools
Title I LEAP
Behavior/Attitude Check List, Affective Domain
(Continued)

Items	Date Recorded			
C. Cooperation				
1. The child shares materials.				
2. The child is willing to take turns.				
3. The child listens to others (peers and teachers).				
4. The child responds to suggestions as well as commands.				
5. The child asks to assist teachers and other students.				
D. Interest				
1. The child expresses a general enthusiasm for the LEAP program.				
2. The child will be able to select materials of interest to him.				
3. The child shares his LEAP accomplishments outside the LEAP Learning Center.				
4. The child brings related information and materials to LEAP sessions.				

A comparison of pre- and post-test tallies for each item (Table 16) indicates that, on the whole, LEAP students exhibited more positive behavior on the spring checklist than they had in the fall. This overall improvement suggests two possibilities: As the year progressed, children had opportunities to practice appropriate behavior and to be praised for such behavior. Secondly, the existence of the checklist causes teachers to be more observant of these behaviors and, in some instances, to teach these behaviors, rather than leave them to chance.

Examination of the pre-test and post-test scores reveals that certain items warrant further analysis. Item A-6: "The child will continue to maintain his own opinions or interest even after finding it unpopular" is such an item. The item reflects a behavior which may not be as relevant in Title I classes as it is in others. Teachers may want to re-examine this item and determine if there are specific activities which should be encouraged in order to have children demonstrate this type of behavior.

By the same token, Item D-4: "The child brings related information and materials to LEAP sessions" was deemed not relevant by a number of LEAP teachers, as a means of measuring Interest. This is particularly apparent in the scores for Kindergarten children. It may well be that this is an

TABLE 16

		K				Grade 1				Grade 2			
		Pre		Post		Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		Self Confidence											
A	1	27	47	37	65	61	64	81	84	48	73	55	83
	2	34	60	50	88	76	79	90	94	61	92	62	94
	3	27	47	51	89	74	77	94	98	55	83	64	97
	4	23	40	38	67	46	48	70	73	40	61	50	76
	5	29	51	46	81	66	69	84	88	55	83	63	95
	6	18	32	21	37	28	29	45	47	26	39	33	50
	7	37	65	50	88	79	82	86	90	56	85	62	94
		Responsibility											
B	1	48	84	50	88	88	92	91	95	65	98	66	1.00
	2	31	54	43	75	80	83	88	92	62	94	64	97
	3	18	32	18	32	58	60	61	64	50	76	52	79
	4	35	61	38	67	58	60	73	76	54	82	61	92
	5	28	49	39	68	47	49	71	74	33	50	44	67
		Cooperation											
C	1	45	79	51	89	81	84	89	93	64	97	63	95
	2	45	79	47	82	83	86	91	95	63	95	66	1.00
	3	51	89	53	93	77	80	86	90	58	88	63	95
	4	41	72	45	79	75	78	90	94	59	89	64	97
	5	20	35	26	46	43	45	70	73	45	68	57	86
		Interest											
D	1	38	67	51	89	80	83	94	98	62	93	62	94
	2	24	42	31	54	51	53	71	74	50	76	58	88
	3	13	23	28	49	46	48	69	72	36	55	51	77
	4	5	8	15	26	28	29	41	43	33	50	41	62
Total		57				96				66			

TABLE 16 (CONTINUED)

		Grade 3				Grade 4			
		Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		Self Confidence							
A	1	49	75	53	82	58	72	68	84
	2	55	85	62	95	78	96	80	99
	3	51	78	59	91	68	84	77	95
	4	33	51	52	80	54	67	69	85
	5	45	69	55	85	72	89	76	94
	6	23	35	24	37	35	43	47	58
	7	48	74	59	91	73	90	78	96
		Responsibility							
B	1	65	1.00	64	98	77	95	78	96
	2	59	91	60	92	80	99	79	98
	3	48	74	45	69	67	83	67	83
	4	52	80	58	89	76	94	79	98
	5	46	71	49	75	66	81	73	90
		Cooperation							
C	1	56	86	61	94	71	88	79	98
	2	56	86	59	91	75	93	79	98
	3	56	86	58	89	71	88	77	95
	4	51	78	52	80	69	85	75	93
	5	37	57	48	74	64	79	71	88
		Interest							
D	1	56	86	58	89	69	85	76	94
	2	38	58	55	85	68	84	74	91
	3	37	57	48	74	56	69	69	85
	4	25	38	26	40	41	51	60	74
Total		65				81			

TABLE 16 (CONTINUED)

	Grade 5				Grade 6			
	Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
	Self Confidence							
A 1	56	66	66	78	70	80	76	87
2	76	89	78	92	82	94	84	97
3	71	84	74	87	72	83	77	89
4	50	59	69	81	54	62	57	66
5	69	81	73	86	67	77	77	67
6	37	44	44	52	38	44	50	57
7	76	89	78	92	71	82	78	90
	Responsibility							
B 1	81	95	82	96	80	92	83	95
2	79	93	80	94	80	92	81	93
3	68	80	74	87	73	84	74	85
4	77	91	81	95	80	92	87	1.00
5	60	71	70	82	60	69	69	79
	Cooperation							
C 1	78	92	79	93	77	89	81	93
2	77	91	77	91	80	92	83	95
3	72	85	74	87	71	82	79	91
4	71	84	75	88	72	83	77	89
5	57	67	65	76	50	57	63	72
	Interest							
D 1	67	79	76	89	63	66	69	72
2	53	62	63	74	57	59	72	83
3	43	51	49	58	41	43	50	57
4	40	47	52	61	40	42	50	57
Total	85				87			

accurate reflection of the LEAP kindergarten program, and relates to the results indicated for Item B-3: "The child will bring the necessary materials to work in class." Since scores for this item increase appreciably in the upper grades, it seems to be an appropriate item for grades one through six.

It is hoped that the LEAP staff will continue to refine the instrument in the future. In addition, LEAP teachers may want to compare Spring 1976 results with Fall 1976 results. Where there seems to have been regression over the summer (which is not unusual), further analysis of specific cases seems warranted. This additional attention to individualization should be in consonance with the overall approach of the LEAP activities.

In all, the Behavior Attitude Checklist is an important facet of the LEAP program. The behavior it records is intimately related to more general, cognitive, learning and achievement. LEAP staff members have expended considerable effort on this difficult task, and its inclusion in the program is a sign of the breadth and depth of LEAP activities.

Results of Parent Questionnaire

A parent questionnaire was distributed to parents of children in the LEAP program. The results of the questionnaire are shown, by grade, in Table 17. A summary of the results appears in Table 18.

TABLE 17

Tally of Responses to Parent Questionnaire

Questionnaire Item	Kindergarten			Grade 1		
	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	13	2	4	56	1	7
2	21	1	4	47	4	13
3	21	0	3	62	1	0
4	18	1	3	58	2	4
5	13	1	5	48	2	13
6	21	1	2	53	0	10
7	20	2	2	52	0	9
8	8	4	4	43	4	8
Number of Returns	27			64		

TABLE 17 (CONTINUED)

Tally of Responses to Parent Questionnaire

Questionnaire Item	Grade 2			Grade 3		
	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	50	0	4	47	0	2
2	41	3	8	40	5	6
3	49	2	3	35	2	3
4	48	2	4	47	0	3
5	43	3	6	44	1	5
6	47	1	6	45	0	5
7	44	3	6	45	0	5
8	37	7	13	32	7	11
Number of Returns	55			50		

TABLE 17 (CONTINUED)

Tally of Responses to Parent Questionnaire

Questionnaire Item	Grade 4			Grade 5		
	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	55	0	6	45	0	6
2	46	6	8	41	3	7
3	54	2	4	43	0	3
4	57	0	3	48	0	3
5	51	3	6	43	5	5
6	53	1	6	44	1	5
7	50	5	6	43	2	8
8	36	7	17	35	7	8
Number of Returns	61			52		

TABLE 17 (CONTINUED)

Tally of Responses to Parent Questionnaire

Questionnaire Item	Grade 6		
	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	41	1	6
2	28	4	14
3	34	7	5
4	37	0	9
5	37	4	5
6	28	6	13
7	24	12	11
8	28	6	12
Number of Returns	47		

TABLE 18

Summary of Responses to Parent Questionnaire

	Agree		Disagree		Uncertain	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1	307	86	4	1	35	10
2	264	74	26	7	60	17
3	298	84	14	4	21	6
4	313	88	3	1	29	8
5	279	78	19	5	45	13
6	291	82	10	3	47	13
7	278	78	24	7	47	13
8	219	62	38	11	73	21
Number of Returns	356					

Generally speaking, parents approve of the LEAP program. Eighty-six per cent feel that LEAP has helped the child in his/her reading (Question 1). There is overall agreement among parents that the LEAP program is effective (Question 4), and that the children have favorable feelings about the program (Question 3).

While the vast majority, 74%, feel that LEAP has contributed toward improving attitudes toward school (Question 2), 17% are uncertain about this factor. The greatest number of "uncertain" responses appear in grade one and six. This suggests that parents of children in these grades may require more information about the LEAP program. Similarly, grade six parents seemed most "uncertain" about having children continue in the LEAP program next year (Question 7). The transition from the elementary grades to the junior high school is frequently a difficult one, and parents often have questions concerning this transition. This seems to be reflected in this response.

The responses to Question 8 warrant further examination. Seventy-three parents, 21% of those responding, are "uncertain" their children are "reading more books for enjoyment." Thirty-eight parents, 11% of those queried, disagree with the statement. Agreement is recorded by 219 parents, 62% of the total. This is certainly a large proportion of parents,

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS 1975-1976

School_____ Date_____

Grade child is in this year_____

TITLE I - LEAP

Parent Questionnaire

	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1. The LEAP program has been of help to my child in his/her reading.			
2. The LEAP program has contributed to improving my child's attitude toward school.			
3. My child likes the special help he/she is getting in the LEAP program.			
4. I think the special help LEAP provides is effective.			
5. I think my child's attitude toward reading has improved because of LEAP.			
6. I think the LEAP program will help my child in school next year.			
7. I think my child should continue in the LEAP program next year.			
8. My child is reading more books for enjoyment than he/she did last year.			

Comments_____

and is an appropriate commentary on the facet of the LEAP program. Given the recorded responses to other questions, it is likely the LEAP staff will endeavor to improve this percentage in the future. It is possible that parents who recorded "disagree" or "uncertain" responses need further data from the staff in order to respond positively. Parents may find that information and records which teachers have gathered are useful in assessing such questions as this. Children may, in fact, be reading more, but it may not be noted. In addition, techniques for encouraging reading might be shared with parent groups, which will, in turn, serve to promote reading for enjoyment among children. The LEAP program has popular parent support; suggestions for increasing that support are found in the section on Recommendations.

Parent Advisory Council Comments

While the activities of the Parent Advisory Council are noted in the section on Program in Progress, comments of individual members of the PAC follow. These comments reflect an important aspect of the efforts made by the LEAP staff to involve parents in the program. PAC's serve as an important communication channel between the school and the community and through dissemination activities, encourage increased support for Title I in particular and the schools in general.

* * *

Dear Sirs:

Another successful year has come to an end for the Parents Advisory Council. Through the great efforts of the parents we have made many accomplishments to spread the word of LEAP.

The use of media, booklets, open house, workshops and conferences have been a great asset to us.

As more years come upon us I sincerely hope that the LEAP program will continue to grow in success and the news of its progress will become known to all of the people whose children may benefit from its education aids.

Sincerely,

Roseleen Dello Russo
Chairperson Parents Advisory
Council

* * *

* * *

Being a member of the PAC team has been a very enlightening experience. You really never realize what goes into a program of this sort until you're involved in it yourself.

The Title I program is geared around reading, speech, and physical education. If a child has trouble in these areas he will never be able to attain his full potential. The child is given additional help outside the classroom by a very well-qualified staff. With this extra help he is able to gain confidence in himself. Title I helps mold his whole attitude toward school and the learning process.

Mrs. Marie Wise
St. Raphael School

* * *

* * *

Dear Mrs. Miles:

This school year could not come to an end without my letting the entire Title I LEAP staff know how much I, as a parent and Parent Advisory Council member, appreciate the chance to become involved and feel needed.

As this was my first complete year on the Parent Advisory Council, I have been fortunate to see first hand, how much dedicated time and care is given to our children by a most competent, friendly, "always there" staff.

The Parent Advisory Council is an excellent means of keeping communication channels open between both instructors and parents.

I have met many new friends and can only hope for an equally satisfying year in 1976 - 1977 as a Parent Advisory Council member.

Thank you,

Nancy Iovanni
Tufts School

* * *

* * *

Dear Sirs,

After completing my second year on the PAC, I have found that it was more fulfilling than ever. The parents on the council work well together. I have attended workshops and visited another school system.

The LEAP program is excellent and I enjoy being involved in it.

My congratulations to all who run Title I and make it a success.

Sincerely,

Francis C. Amari

* * *

Conclusions

1. The LEAP staff has provided a high quality instructional program to the participating children. The evaluators believe the program has helped these children to make appreciable gains in all areas of the California Achievement Tests and in knowledge of word analysis skills (phonics and structural analysis). In some instances the magnitude of gains made in an eight month period is not great. But it should be noted that these children's rate of achievement in the past has been less than the average for children of their age. Nevertheless, the magnitude of gain in language mechanics, total language and spelling has been quite satisfactory.

2. The need for continued emphasis on reading is evident from the data. The magnitude of gain in reading is not great although significant. Throughout the upper grades (3 to 6) reading performance remains below grade placement norms. Knowledge of fundamental phonics skills evidently was acquired. Children in grades 5 and 6 should be instructed on a range of structural analysis skills so that a higher level of proficiency in syllable division will result. In addition, systematic vocabulary development and instruction in reading comprehension should be continued.

3. Kindergarten children made appreciable gains in knowledge of letters and sounds and in aural comprehension.

In combination with improvement in other aspects of speech and language as effected by speech and language specialists, these children are better prepared for first grade instruction than would otherwise have been the case.

4. The physical education component of Project LEAP seemed very successful in identifying and remediating areas of weakness in psychomotor development. Selection of children through teacher referral appeared to be successful in identifying children who had weaknesses (as verified on the initial test) and who could profit from the physical education program.

5. There has been general improvement in adjustment and attitude as shown in the Behavior/Attitude checklist results.

6. Parents have indicated very strong positive feelings about the program. Many have not felt they can judge whether their children have increased in the extent of their reading. Steps that would help parents to observe their children's performance and progress should be explored.

Recommendations

1. Operation LEAP should be continued as a broadly based language education program with facets directed toward kindergarten children and with a physical education component.

2. The LEAP staff should investigate available methodology and materials for improving word analysis skills at an intermediate grade level (e.g. morphemic analysis and syllabication), developing vocabulary, and building reading comprehension. Procedures found suitable should be incorporated into the existing program without detracting from the work that is being done in oral and written language.

3. The Medford school department should continue to provide the often excellent facilities made available to the LEAP program. Improvement in physical facilities should be made wherever necessary. In particular, the LEAP room at the Osgood school should be renovated.

4. Staff inservice workshops by LEAP specialists should be continued and staff member expertise should be shared with the LEAP staff. Noteworthy examples this year were the in-service programs conducted by specialists and the sharing of audio-visual information by Ms. Indigaro.

5. The LEAP director should remain informed about population shifts in target schools. Should the number of non-English speaking children increase appreciably in one or more schools, in-service instruction on appropriate methods and materials should be provided.

6. Use of Behavior/Attitude checklist should be continued for evaluating growth in the affective domain. Checklist items should be reevaluated by the staff with respect to their relevance to program objectives and procedures, and with respect to instances of little improvement between pre- and post-test ratings. After this examination by the LEAP staff, the checklist should be revised if necessary. Revision should precede the checklist's use in the fall.

7. In-service instruction should be provided that is directed to problems of interest, attitude, and adjustment which may be revealed in the initial administration of the Behavior/Attitude checklist in the fall.

8. In the fall, teachers should note signs of regression by individual children who continue in the program in 1976-1977. Regression may occur in achievement or in affect. LEAP instructors should compare spring 1976 and fall 1976 achievement results and behavior/attitude ratings, and should observe daily performance of children to make these determinations. Following the identification of children who show regression, the staff should plan a program for individual children with school personnel and the school adjustment counselor.

9. To encourage extensive independent reading after

school hours, and to help parents become aware of children's reading, LEAP instructors should encourage children to bring in regularly a list of books they have read outside school, such lists to be signed by the parents.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

1975-1976

Name_____ School_____

Psycho-Motor Development Check List - Grade I

Given two tries the child can:

a) Catch a large ball bounced by another child from a five foot distance.

b) Bounce a large ball to another child 15 feet away.

c) Throw a large ball a distance of 10 feet accurately.

d) Catch a large ball thrown from a distance of 15 feet.

Child can:

e) Jump over a rope held a few inches above the ground.

f) Hop.

g) Skip.

h) Gallop.

i) Walk forward across a walking board without stepping off.

j) Walk backward across a walking board stepping off no more than twice.

k) Walk sidewise across a walking board without stepping off.

l) Hop on one foot 10 times, change to other foot and repeat.

m) Hop once on right foot and once on left foot alternating without stopping for 30 seconds.

n) (Refer to Kraus-Weber test - Purdue Perceptual Motor Survey.) Hold his head, shoulders, and chest off the floor for 10 seconds.

o) (Angels in the Snow - refer to pages 45 and 46 PPMS.) Perform tasks 1-10 showing only slight hesitancy in some patterns and can correct any overflow or restricted movement in one repetition.

p) (Visual Achievement Forms - Refer to pages 67-68 PPMS.) Draw forms 1-5 adequately with minor distortions and no segmenting.

Title I - LEAP
Psycho-Motor Dev. Check List
Grade I - Continued

q) Organize forms 1-5 left to right, top to bottom; size adequate.

r) Touch the following body parts on command: Head, toes, eyes, wrists, back, ankles, nose, feet, chest, elbows, ears, legs, mouth, fingers, stomach, chin, waist, and shoulders.

s) Point to the following direction: front, back, up, down, and beside you.

t) With two blocks on a table, point under, over, top, bottom, and between.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

1975-1976

Name_____ School_____

Psycho-Motor Development Check List - Grade II

Given two tries the child can:

a) Bounce a ball eleven times using alternate hands.

b) Throw a large ball a distance of twenty feet accurately.

c) Bounce a ball a distance of fifteen feet to another child.

Child can:

d) Do eight sit ups.

e) Skip.

f) Walk forward across a walking board without stepping off.

g) Walk backward across a walking board stepping off no more than twice.

h) Walk sidewise across a walking board without stepping off.

i) Hop on one foot ten times, change to other foot, and repeat.

j) Hop once on right foot and once on left foot alternating without stopping for thirty seconds.

k) (Refer to Kraus-Weber test - PPMS.) Hold his head, shoulders, and chest off the floor for ten seconds.

l) (Angels in the Snow - refer to pages 45 and 46 PPMS.) Perform tasks 1-10 showing only slight hesitancy in some patterns and can correct any overflow or restricted movement in one repetition.

m) (Visual achievement forms - refer to pages 67 and 68 PPMS.) Draw forms 1-5 adequately with minor distortions and no segmenting.

n) Organize forms 1-5 left to right, top to bottom, size adequate.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS
TITLE I - LEAP
1975-1976

Name_____ School_____

Psycho-Motor Development Check List - Grade III

Given two tries a child can:

a) Dribble a utility ball a distance of thirty-five feet.

b) Bat a utility ball with fist or hand thirty-five feet.

c) Kick a soccer ball twenty feet.

d) Throw a playground ball thirty feet.

e) Kick a ball that is in motion.

Child can:

f) Jump over a swaying jump rope held a few inches above the ground.

g) Do fifteen sit-ups.

h) Walk forward across a walking board, maintaining dynamic body balance throughout.

i) Walk backward across a walking board stepping off not more than once.

j) Hop twice on right foot and twice on left foot alternating for thirty seconds.

k) (Refer to Kraus-Weber test - PPMS.) Hold his head, shoulders, and chest off the floor for ten seconds.

l) Hold his legs ten inches off the floor for ten seconds without bending his knees.

m) (Angels in the Snow - refer to pages 45 and 46 PPMS.) Performs tasks 1-10 adequately.

n) (Visual achievement forms - refer to pages 67 and 68 PPMS.) Draw forms 1-7 adequately.

o) Organize forms 1-7 left to right, top to bottom; size adequate.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

1975-1976

Name_____ School_____

Psycho-Motor Development Check List - Grade IV

Given two tries the child can:

a) Dribble a basketball a distance of fifty feet and back.

b) Shoot a basketball with one or two hands.

c) Kick a soccer ball thirty-five feet.

d) Catch a softball thrown thirty feet.

e) Throw a softball fifty feet.

Child can:

f) Do twenty sit ups.

g) Walk forward across a walking board, maintaining dynamic body balance throughout.

h) Walk backward across a walking board, stepping off not more than once.

i) Hop twice on right foot and twice on left foot alternating for thirty seconds.

j) (Refer to Kraus-Weber test - PPMS.) Hold his head, shoulders, and chest off the floor for ten seconds.

k) Hold his legs ten inches off the floor for ten seconds without bending knees.

l) (Angels in the Snow - refer to pages 45 and 46 PPMS.) Performs tasks 1-10 adequately.

m) (Visual achievement forms - refer to pages 67 and 68 PPMS.) Draw forms 1-7 adequately.

n) Organize forms 1-7 left to right, top to bottom; size adequate.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

1975-1976

Name_____ School_____

Psycho-Motor Development Check List - Grade V

Child can:

a) Shoot a basketball for accuracy.
(Sink two out of five shots.)

b) Catch a playground ball thrown forty-five feet.

c) Kick a soccer ball forty-five feet.

d) Dribble a basketball fifty feet in a straight line without losing control of the ball, and without deviating more than two feet from the line.

e) Walk across a walking board backward without stepping off.

f) Hop twice on right foot and once on left for fifteen seconds.

g) Hop twice on left foot and once on right for fifteen seconds.

h) (Refer to Kraus-Weber Test - PPMS.) Hold his head, shoulders, and chest off the floor for ten seconds.

i) Hold his legs ten inches off the floor for ten seconds without bending knees.

j) (Angels in the Snow - Refer to pages 45 and 46 PPMS.) Performs tasks 1-10 adequately.

k) (Visual achievement forms - Refer to pages 67 and 68 PPMS.) Draw forms 1-7 with no distortions or segmenting.

l) Organize forms 1-7, left to right, top to bottom; size adequate.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

1975-1976

Name_____ School_____

Psycho-Motor Development Check List - Grade VI

Child can:

a) Kick a moving soccer ball sixty feet.

b) Throw a utility ball fifty-five feet.

c) Shoot a basketball for accuracy.
(Sink four out of seven shots.)

d) Catch a playground ball thrown sixty feet.

e) Walk across a walking board backward without stepping off.

f) Hop twice on right foot and once on left for fifteen seconds.

g) Hop twice on left foot and once on right for fifteen seconds.

h) (Refer to Kraus-Weber test PPMS.) Hold his head, shoulders and chest off the floor for ten seconds without bending knees.

i) Hold his legs ten inches off the floor for ten seconds without bending knees.

j) (Angels in the Snow - Refer to pages 45 and 46 PPMS.) Perform tasks 1-10 adequately.

k) (Visual achievement forms - Refer to pages 67 and 68 PPMS.) Draw forms 1-7 with no distortions or segmenting.

l) Organize forms 1-7 left to right, top to bottom; size adequate.

REMEDIAL READING SPECIALISTS

As Title I Remedial Reading Specialist, I am responsible for planning and implementing suitable programs to satisfy the individual needs of qualified Title I students in the growth and development of cognitive skills essential to reading and in the practice of cognitive skills through individualized reading programs.

I am the reading specialist at six schools and work with approximately forty-five children. They are seen twice a week (one-half hour each session) in a small group (two to five children) or on a one to one basis.

Many of the children I work with are also seen by the public school reading specialists. We meet on a regular basis to discuss pupil progress. The Gray's Oral Reading Test, Gilmore Oral Reading Test, and the Stanford Dictated Spelling Test are the diagnostic instruments used by the public school reading specialists. The results of these tests are used for the diagnosis and evaluation of Title I students in the remedial reading program.

I use the Woodcock Reading Mastery test as a diagnostic instrument. Children are referred by the LEAP instructors in each school. After a diagnosis is made, an evaluation is given to the instructor. I am available to other members of the LEAP staff, as well as the public school teachers and parents for consultation.

I have participated in five CORE evaluations, presenting Title I test results and a diagnosis of the child's reading disabilities. Four children were referred to 766 programs and one child continued in Title I.

I attended a two day reading conference in Hyannis sponsored by the Massachusetts Reading Association. I participated in many workshops and saw many new reading materials that are now available. Following this conference, a workshop was presented by the Reading Specialists to the Title I staff. "Learning Styles in Children" and "Reading Games and Devices" were the primary focus of this learning session.

A parent workshop was also conducted. The role of the reading specialist was discussed as well as ideas for learning games that parents can make at home and use with their children. Current materials that are used in the Title I program were demonstrated. The parents then split into two groups, one group experiencing a testing session (the phonics inventory) and the other group making a picture classification game to be used at the primary level for their children at home.

Sherrie R. Wolfson,
Title I Remedial Reading Specialist

Sherrie R. Wolfson, Remedial Reading Specialist

Statistics - 1975-1976

Number of children referred	55
Number of children that received help	44
Number of children that have improved	26
Number of children that should remain in the Title I Remedial Reading Program	18

REMEDIAL READING SPECIALIST

As a Remedial Reading Specialist in Medford's Title I Program, LEAP, I am responsible for planning and providing individualized reading programs for the growth and development of students' cognitive reading skills. I am also available for consultations with the rest of the LEAP staff concerning their students' reading programs. In these conferences, which follow a diagnostic assessment of their students, I made recommendations and suggestions for the sort of remedial techniques I feel would be most beneficial for these students.

I am the Remedial Reading Specialist in three shcools: the Franklin, the Swan, and the Osgood. I presently work with thirty-four students. I am wholly responsible for thirty of these students' reading programs. Four of these children I see in a team teaching situation one day a week with a LEAP instructor. Two students are seen individually, while the remaining children are instructed in small groups of four or five children.

This past year I attended five Open Houses at the three schools I visit each day. I also participated in a two-day conference conducted by the Massachusetts Reading Association in Hyannis, Mass. In a sharing session given by the Reading Specialists with the LEAP staff, I reported on one of the workshops I attended at this conference. This workshop dealt with the Principles and Application of Comprehension Skills in the middle grades and adapting Bloom's Taxonomy of Behavioral Objectives to Cognition in Reading. I also was available in this session for discussing materials I had viewed. In addition, I attended the Orton Society Reading Conference in Cranston, Rhode Island. At this day long meeting, I observed how to make various teaching games involving reading sub-skills, and also how to develop and organize a learning situation with students involving the writing and setting up of contracts.

I also was involved with the other Reading Specialist in the LEAP Program in conducting a workshop with the Parents Advisory Council. In this very productive meeting I discussed my specific role in the program and in the three schools I visit. I also showed some of the types of materials I use in instructing my children and how some of the material could be adapted for teaching various skills in reading. I also emphasized the need for reliable testing and gave the Parents Advisory Council the chance to experience some of the feelings their children experience in a similar testing situation. At this time, I administered an example of a Cloze Test I had administered to fifth and sixth grade students. They were also shown the various components that make up the Woodcock Reading Test and how a student's oral reading level is determined by the Gray Oral Reading Test.

In addition, I also viewed along with two PAC Representatives and the other Remedial Reading Specialist the Title I program which is set up in Pembroke, Mass.

The individual diagnostic instruments I use are the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests, the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty, and the Gray Oral Reading Test. The Gray Oral Reading Test was given in a pre- and post-testing situation. I also administered various Cloze Tests and Informal Inventories in determining the reading levels of my students. I also used the results of the diagnostic tools employed by the regular school remedial reading teachers if they had been involved previously with any of my students.

Maureen O'Neill,
Title I Remedial Reading Specialist

Maureen O'Neill, Remedial Reading Specialist

Statistics - 1975-1976

Number of children referred	42
Number of children that received specialized help	36
Number of children diagnosed	34
Number of children that showed appreciable gains	34
Number of children that should continue to receive supplementary instruction	34
Number of children dismissed	2

Most of the children I have are gaining in work attack skills or comprehension; however, all still need the extra instruction provided by the LEAP staff.

SPEECH AND LANGUAGE SPECIALISTS

Communication, as indicated in the title Language Education Acceleration Program, is the focus of the Title I program. Listening, and speaking skills (important among the program's behavioral objectives) are the first two steps to successful communication and educational functioning.

The speech pathologists offering language services are responsible for evaluating communication behavior and for devising intervention programs for those found to have special needs in speech and language. Language impairments may range from problems in phonology to deviation in grammatical structure or cognitive ability and to problems in written or gestural language.

At the beginning of the school year the LEAP speech and language pathologists diagnose problems exhibited by children who have been identified for the program. This is accomplished through formal and informal testing procedures. These problems may reveal themselves as difficulties in processing language at the level of phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics both in decoding and encoding tasks and affecting both the spoken and written forms of language. Children selected are scheduled for therapy once or twice a week in coordination with the programs of other LEAP personnel.

The speech and language pathologists develop individual programs of therapy. Frequent consultation to supply information and support to other LEAP staff members and classroom teachers is conducted throughout the year. When a child in the LEAP program has been referred for evaluation by the Core Evaluation Team, the Title I speech and language pathologists provide input and are often asked to participate in related conferences. In addition, periodic conferences for parent counseling and instruction are scheduled. This accompanies ongoing evaluation for determination of pupil dismissal and changes in programming. Children dismissed from formal therapy often continue on an observation basis.

In addition, the speech pathologists screen pre-school children for speech and language skills during kindergarten registration. At this time conferences are arranged with parents concerned about their children's abilities.

The speech and language pathologists are also responsible for staff in-service training sessions in which are presented demonstrations of instructional procedures and techniques for developing communication skills in the classroom. They also present a workshop to the Parent Advisory Council to provide speech and language information and activities which parents can use in the home setting.

Andrea Marks and Gwendolyn Black,
Speech and Language Pathologists

Gwendolyn Black, Speech and Language Specialist

Statistics - 1975-1976

Number of children referred	61
Number of children evaluated	93
Number of children enrolled for therapy	37
Number of children on observation	14
Number of children terminating therapy	12
Number of children continuing therapy	9
Number of parents contacted for conferences	35

Andrea Marks, Speech and Language Specialist

Statistics 1975-1976

Number of children referred	50
Number of children evaluated	50
Number of children enrolled in therapy	38
Number of children on observation	9
Number of children terminating therapy	16
Number of children continuing therapy	13
Number of parents contacted for conferences	33

PHYSICAL EDUCATION SPECIALIST

As the LEAP physical education specialist, I am responsible for providing small group and individualized physical education experiences for identified children in the target schools. I try to see each child twice a week for a half hour usually in a small group. The activities and skills involved in these sessions cover a broad range of physical education experiences. I work on meeting the child's particular weaknesses such as flexibility, coordination, agility, balance and strength, and also teach them specific sports skills. The LEAP physical education program also serves as a supplement to the existing physical education program and aids the identified children in meeting its performance objectives.

Another aspect of the LEAP physical education program which I feel is the most important is the development and improvement of self-image. This year I conducted a recreation and sports therapy type program with fifth and sixth graders as a means of improving their self image. This approach was very successful and I intend to continue it next year with the older children.

This year I also provided information on Title I children to the CORE Evaluation Team, and assisted them in assessing the children's psychomotor needs. I conducted a workshop for the Parent Advisory Council, explaining my role in the overall LEAP approach, and I have made myself available for numerous parent conferences.

In September of this school year, I developed a psycho-motor checklist made up of modified significant items from the Purdue Perceptual Motor Survey and the Medford Public Schools Physical Education Objectives list. The checklist was used as a pre- and post-evaluation device.

This year, the criterion I used for selecting children for the LEAP physical education program was referrals from classroom teachers, LEAP staff, and school department specialists.

Paul Mattatall
Physical Education Specialist

LEAP PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER SCHOOL

Hancock	25
Columbus	24
Kennedy	18
Osgood	12
Franklin	4
Tufts	2
Swan	1
St. Joseph's	3
St. Raphael's	2
	91

Paul Mattatall, Physical Education Specialist

Statistics - 1975-1976

Number of children referred	60
Number of children diagnosed	140
Number of children receiving special help	91
Number of children dismissed	15

SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT COUNSELOR

The School Adjustment Counselor serves as an important member of the Title I LEAP team. The Adjustment Counselor's evaluation of an individual child's needs in our program is necessary for the successful experience of a child in Title I.

The Adjustment Counselor serves as a consultant to the LEAP instructors and other specialists in the program. The Counselor also meets with classroom teachers, principals and other school personnel when it is necessary, based on referral of a child.

I also serve as a liaison to the regular school guidance department by maintaining an involvement in their activities and specialized conferences. I act as a source of referral to community agencies for parents and children in our program when it is indicated.

In a certain number of cases, I counsel children on an individual basis with frequency dependent on the severity of the problem. This past school year I have conducted in-service meetings for our Title I LEAP staff and the Parent Advisory Counsel. I also prepared a booklet of teaching strategies for our Title I instructional staff.

Maria Ceddia
School Adjustment Counselor

Maria Ceddia, School Adjustment Counselor

Statistics - 1975-1976

Number of children referred	35
Number of children receiving specialized services	14
Number of children on observation	10
Number of children dismissed	9
Number of referrals to outside agencies	2

LEAP 1975-1976

Final Evaluation Report

CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGIST

As consulting psychologist to the LEAP program during the 1975-1976 school year, my primary responsibilities have been to assess children in the LEAP program, to support personnel in designing and implementing individualized programs for children who have shown limited academic gains or behavior difficulties, to help coordinate LEAP staff and other school personnel in planning and/or implementing educational programs for children, to utilize school or community resources where necessary, and to provide consultation about effective ways of working with parents. Typically I would observe the child in class or in the LEAP tutorial or both, review the child's records, and speak to all personnel involved in providing educational services for the child. Frequently, the final discussion of the case would be in a group conference including all involved school personnel.

There are several ways in which this consultation supplements services provided by Chapter 766. There are some children I have seen in LEAP who are not making adequate progress, but whose cases do not warrant referral for a CORE evaluation. There have been some cases in which a joint examination of a child's progress prompts referral for a CORE. Finally, in my view, the greatest limitation of the CORE evaluation is the lack of follow-up consultation to the teacher and other related personnel to explain and support the implementation of the educational plan. This is the major area in which my services have been utilized.

This year I have worked in six schools visiting the St. Clement's, Hervey, Hancock, Osgood, Kennedy, and Swan schools. There have been eight new cases and seven follow-up cases during eight consultations. The details of the cases are available in the consultation reports in the LEAP office. In brief, of these 15 children, three were referred for a CORE and provisional plans developed until the evaluations and plans were completed. One child showed marked improvement and needed no change in his program. The remainder were in need of coordinated staff efforts to correct academic or management problems.

Susan M. Swap, Ph.D.